

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/863,831	05/23/2001	Suresh V. Garimella	PU62	8979	
7:	590 03/06/2002				
Mr. Edward J. Timmer			EXAMINER		
Walnut Woods Centre 5955 W. Main Street Kalamazoo, MI 49009			MEDLEY,	MEDLEY, PETER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834		
			DATE MAILED: 03/06/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
7	09/863,831	GARIMELLA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peter M Medley	2834
The MAILING DATE of this communication		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Clarafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ron. a reply within the statutory minimum of third beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•	
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur Disposition of Claims		
<u> </u>	ation	
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applic		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	and/or algetica requirement	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a Application Papers	ma/or election requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exal	miner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 May 2001</u> is/are	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected	to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection	- , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	` '
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _		isapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docur		
2. Certified copies of the priority docur	·	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action for a	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for don	nestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dor		
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.	3) 5) Notice of i	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Application/Control Number: 09/863,831

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toki.

With respect to claims 1-3, the reference discloses a device in **figs. 3(a)** and **3(b)** comprising a housing 1, apertures 3 and 4, a piezoelectric bimorph actuator 7.

With respect to claim 4, 5, and 9, the reference discloses in **fig. 6(a)** electrodes, interface **15**, and a source.

With respect to claim 7, the reference discloses a free end 6.

With respect to claim 8, the reference discloses in **fig. 1(a)** a blade fixed on both ends.

With respect to claims 14-18, the method claims are inherent from the structure.

3. Claims 6, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura et al.

The reference discloses in **fig. 2** a device comprising housing **12**, apertures **30a**, **b**, a bimorph disc **18a**, and source **50**.

Application/Control Number: 09/863,831

Art Unit: 2834

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toki.

The reference discloses a device in **figs. 3(a)** and **3(b)** comprising a housing **1**, apertures **3** and **4**, a piezoelectric bimorph actuator **7**.

The reference does not disclose the exact dimensions.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been well known in the art the shape of apertures affects airflow. The court has stated that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the width and diameter of the apertures for the purpose of affecting the airflow.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al.

The reference discloses in **fig. 2** a device comprising housing **12**, apertures **30a**, **b**, a bimorph disc **18a**, and source **50**.

The reference does not disclose a groove.

Application/Control Number: 09/863,831

Art Unit: 2834

Page 4

The reference discloses a shelf **14b**. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known that groove is the structural equivalent of a groove for the purpose of fixing the edge of the disc. It would have been well known in the art to use a groove in the Nakamura et al reference for the purpose of fixing the edge of the disc.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter M Medley whose telephone number is 703-305-0494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3432 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

NESTOR KAMIREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

PM March 3, 2002